

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the final Office Action mailed July 17, 2007. Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17 and 18 are amended herein. Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19 and 20 are cancelled. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute cancelled and withdrawn claims in continuation and divisional applications.

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17 and 18 remain for the Examiner's consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 14-20 have been objected to for lacking of antecedent basis. Claims 14, 17 and 18 have been amended to recite the correct antecedent basis to Claim 13.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Humphrey et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0003039) in view of Rekimoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,341).

Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19 and 20 are cancelled.

The Examiner states that Rekimoto teaches “each display processor configured with directional information for at least one neighboring display (fig. 5, label 510; fig. 7, labels 708, 710; par [0063]; par [0067], lines 23-27)”. In Figure 5 there are labels 510a and 510b but no label 510. In Figure 7 the labels 708 and 710 are “Content Update is propagated through the Cloud” and “Individual Clients download from Repository”. Neither of these Figures indicate that there is directional information for moving the content from one display to a neighboring display. A word search of Humphrey indicates that the words ‘direction’ and ‘reverse’ do not appear and that ‘forwarded’ but not ‘forward’ appears once with respect to a ‘forwarded query’.

Further, inspection of paragraph [0063] reveals no teaching or suggestion referring to directional information. Lines 23-27 of paragraph [0067] are “[b]ecause the content index 516 is essentially a collection of pointers to the location of the actual content information, clients must then locate the content repository 510 of interest to download content information, at step 710”. The Applicant finds no explicit support for directional information. Indeed, any implicit direction in this statement is not consistent with the other elements of the limitation, i.e., that the directional information be for a ‘neighboring display’. Humphrey discloses cloud systems where it is not possible to define directional information. In Rekimoto, directional information is not relevant in this ‘pick and drop’ based disclosure. Thus, neither Rekimoto not Humphrey teach or suggest the concept of directional information or determining the direction of a gesture (Claim 1) or reverse propagation direction (Claim 3) and how these concepts are employed in the invention by the Applicant.

Claim 1

The Examiner states that with respect to Claim 1, Rekimoto teaches a first display in visual proximity to a second display (fig 16, labels 25D, 26; col 19 lines 58-63; col 11, lines 63-67; col 12 lines 1-2). The Applicant respectfully disagrees that Rekimoto teaches or suggests a first display in visual proximity to a second display. None of the text cited by the Examiner states that the displays are in visual proximity and it is suggested that the Examiner is interpreting that which is represented in Figure 16 in accordance with the proposed claims using hindsight reconstruction.

The Examiner’s conclusory statements are exactly the response prohibited by the Supreme Court, see Ex parte Kubin, BPAI Appeal 2007-0819 (May 31, 2007) "rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness". KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385 at 1396 (2007). The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner articulate the reasoning behind the conclusory statements that directional information, reverse propagation direction, determining the direction of a gesture and visual proximity are based. “In order to provide a complete application file history and to enhance the clarity of the prosecution history record, an examiner must provide clear

explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application”. MPEP 707.07(f).

In an attempt to further clarify the novelty of the invention, Claim 1 has been amended to include the consequences of limitations already present in Claim 1, with respect to the first and second displays being in visual proximity. Thus Claim 1 now has the limitation “a processor, that interprets a direction to move the content from the first display based on the gesture, that specifies a second display to which the content is to be moved, based on the gesture and the position of the plurality of displays and that propagates the content of the first display to the second display”. Humphrey teaches a game server used to host services, but does not envisage that a gesture will move content from a first display to a second display, where at least two of the plurality of displays are in visual proximity to each other. Rekimoto teaches or suggests a management table which can register represent data selected by an INPUT OPERATION UNIT (emphasis added) (Rekimoto, col 2, lines 2-5). This data can be shared TO THE APPARATUS THAT HAS REQUESTED DATA TRANSMISSION (emphasis added) (Rekimoto, col 2, lines 16-19). Thus Rekimoto teaches or suggest that the transfer requires two operations, an input operation by one display unit (the pick) and a request operation by a different display unit (the drop). Thus Rekimoto teaches away from the proposed invention. In the Applicant’s invention the second display is slaved such that “gesture input will initiate new content to be displayed in one display and initiate propagation of content along a direction in a neighboring display” (Specification, paragraph [0017] lines 11-12). Further, neither Humphrey nor Rekimoto teach or suggest that the content of one display is sent from a first display to a second display in the direction of the direction information.

Claims 5 and 13

Claims 5 and 13 have been amended to include the limitations “specifying a second display to which the first content is to be moved based on the gesture and the relative position of the plurality of displays” and “interpreting a direction to move the content from the first display based on the gesture presenting the first content at the second display and a second content at the first display” respectively. Since neither Humphrey nor Rekimoto teach or suggest that first content information is sent from the first display to a second display based on the gesture and the

relative position of the plurality of displays, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of these claims (MPEP 2143.03). As such, Claims 5 and 13 were not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 6, 9, 10, 14, 17 and 18 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claims 1, 5 and 13, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claims 1, 5 and 13 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 103 rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 10, 2007

By: /Anthony G. Craig/

Anthony G. Craig
Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
Customer No. 23910